25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8	TOR THE WORTHERWY	DISTRICT OF CALL OR WAY
9		
10	GERARDO HERNANDEZ,	No. C 12-03257 WHA
11	Plaintiff,	
12	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS; GRANTING MOTION
13	TAQUERIA EL GRULLENSE; JUAN FRANCIS GAMEZ GARCIA dba	FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT
14	TAQUERIA EL GRULLENSE; OSCAR PANG CHENG LIU and CHU CHING	AMENDED COMI LAINT
15	LIU as Trustees of the OSCAR PANG CHENG LIU and CHU CHING LIU	
16	TRUST; and DOES 1-10 inclusive,	
17	Defendants.	
18	·	
19	Plaintiff filed a complaint against a number of defendants alleging violations of the	
20	Americans with Disabilities Act and state laws regarding access to public accommodations or	
21	facilities at a restaurant located at 1280 El Camino Real in Redwood City. On September 5,	
2223	2012, defendants Oscar Pang-Cheng Liu and Chu-Ching Kuo Liu moved to dismiss on the	
	ground that the complaint incorrectly named defendants in their capacity as trustees of the Osc	
24	Pang Cheng Liu and Chu Ching Liu Trust. Defendants allege that no such entity exists. In	

g violations of the accommodations or . On September 5, to dismiss on the as trustees of the Oscar ch entity exists. In support of the motion, defendant Mr. Liu filed a declaration with exhibits to show that the property that is the subject of the action is held by the Liu Family Trust.

Plaintiff filed a statement of non-opposition to defendants' motion on September 19. On the same day, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a first amended complaint. Plaintiff's proposed complaint removes named defendants Oscar Pang Cheng Liu and Chu Ching Liu as

trustees of the Oscar Pang Cheng Liu and Chu Ching Liu Trust and adds as defendants Oscar		
Pang-Cheng Liu and Chu-Ching Kuo Liu as individual defendants and as co-trustees of the Liu		
Family Trust. Plaintiff states that, other than to substitute these defendants, no substantive		
changes have been made to the original complaint.		

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, defendants' opposition to plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint was due on October 3. No response has been received. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file the proposed amended complaint is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff may file the proposed amended complaint on the docket. Defendants' motion to dismiss is denied as **MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 9, 2012.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE